

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	8:06CR50
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
RUDOLPH GEORGE STANKO,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

This matter is before the court on motions filed by the defendant: Filing No. 189, objection regarding Roger Roots; Filing No. 190, objection regarding telephone costs; Filing No. 191, motion to proceed in forma pauperis; Filing No. 194, notice of due process; Filing No. 195, motion to go to jail cell; and Filing No. 196, objection.

Filing Nos. 189 and 190

Defendant asks the court to reconsider its rulings regarding the denial of Roger Roots to represent him. The court denied defendant's request to appoint Mr. Roots in this case. Filing No. 174. The court will not reconsider its previous decision refusing to appoint Mr. Roots as counsel in this case. Whether Mr. Roots chooses to make an appearance in this case on behalf of the defendant is between the two of them. The court will not appoint Mr. Roots as standby counsel in this case.

Likewise, defendant asks the court to reconsider reimbursing him for telephone calls in advance of the calls. Again, defendant is directed to confer with standby counsel.

Filing No. 191

Defendant has filed an interlocutory appeal regarding Order numbers 152, 161, 164, and 174. He has asked this court to permit him to proceed in forma pauperis. The court will grant the request to proceed in forma pauperis.

Filing No. 194

Defendant files a notice of due process which the court will view as a motion for due process. Defendant raises issues regarding his access to the law library. However, the court ruled on these issues at the hearing on October 17, 2006. See Filing Nos. 186, 187 and 188. Accordingly, this motion will be denied as moot.

Filing No. 195

Defendant moves to go to the jail cell on October 20, 2006. This request is dated October 16, 2006, prior to the hearing on October 17, 2006. The court has already granted defendant's request to use the federal court library on October 20, 2006. If defendant still wishes to do so, he must so notify the U.S. Marshal's Service. The court will deny this motion as moot.

Filing No. 196

Defendant objects to the ruling of no out-of-state subpoenaed witnesses. The court has ruled on this motion a number of times and will not do so again.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that defendant's motions, Filing Nos. 189, 190, 194, 195, and 196 are denied. Defendant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis, Filing No. 191, is granted.

DATED this 18th day of October, 2006.

BY THE COURT:

s/Joseph F. Bataillon
Chief United States District Judge